

REMARKS

In this response, Applicants have amended claim 13. No new claims have been added. Claims 17-27 have been previously withdrawn. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of pending claims 1-16 in view of at least the following remarks.

I. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102

The Patent Office rejects claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,139,727 issued to Kuballa, et al. ("Kuballa"). In order to anticipate a claim, the relied upon reference must disclose every limitation of the claim.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection above and submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that Kuballa does not describe a plurality of cables terminating about a surface of a substrate such that the conductors of respective ones of the plurality of cables are planarily aligned, in accordance with Applicants' claim 1. Kuballa describes a clamping element for disposing the ends of cable wires through a circuit board so that the ends of the cable wires can be soldered to the leads on the circuit board. (Kuballa column 2 line 66 through column 3 line 5) Figs. 3, 4, and 6 of Kuballa show ends 10 of cable wires 1 extending through circuit board 17 and past the surface of circuit board 17 so that ends 10 can be soldered to leads on the surface of circuit board 17.

The Patent Office has not identified and Applicants are unable to find any description in Kuballa of a plurality of cables terminating about a surface of a substrate so that the conductors of respective ones of the plurality of cables are planarily aligned, as required by Applicants' claim 1. For example, ends 10 of Kuballa extend through circuit board 17 and beyond the far surface of circuit board 17 so they can be soldered to leads on the circuit board, and thus do not terminate about the surface of circuit board 17. Alternatively, once ends 10 are soldered to the leads on circuit board 17, the soldered ends will still terminate above or past the surface of circuit board 17 and will not be planarily aligned since the height of respective ones of the soldered ends will be different. Finally, Applicants point out that there is no description in Kuballa of ends 10 of cable wire 1 being planarily aligned. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the

Patent Office withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kuballa.

Next, the Patent Office rejects claims 1-7 and 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,152,744 issued to Maeda ("Maeda").

Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection above and submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that Maeda does not describe a plurality of cables terminating about a surface of a substrate such that conductors of respective ones of the plurality of cables are available for electrical contact, in accordance with Applicants' claim 1. Maeda describes an improved integrated circuit socket having socket base 1 with either a plurality of electrically conductive terminals 5 or a plurality of coaxial cables 29 extending through socket base 1 around resilient bed 4. (See Maeda column 3 lines 43 through 50, and column 6 lines 19-25) Specifically, Maeda describes the different and second embodiment of Figs. 6 and 7 as including coaxial cables 29 having center conductor 30 soldered to electrically conductive through hole 32 and outer shield 34 soldered to ground layer 35 of contact film 31. (See Maeda column 6 lines 19-36)

However, the Patent Office has not identified and Applicants are unable to find any description in Maeda of a plurality of cables terminating about a surface of a substrate such that conductors of respective ones of the plurality of cables are available for electrical contact as required by Applicants' claim 1. Specifically, conductor 30 and shield 34 of Maeda are soldered to through hole 32 and ground layer 35 of contact film 31, and therefore are not available for electrical contact because (1) conductor 30 and shield 34 are already electrically connected, and (2) conductor 30 and shield 34 are covered by contact film 31. (See Maeda Fig. 7) In addition, Applicants point out that shield 34 of Maeda does not terminate about a surface of the substrate as required by claim 1 but terminates below the surface of the substrate, as shown in Fig. 7 of Maeda. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office withdraw the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Maeda.

Applicants submit that dependent claims 2 through 13 being dependent upon allowable base claim 1, are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons

explained above. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 2-13 as being unpatentable over the cited references.

Next, in addition to being allowable as dependent upon allowable base claim 1, Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection above of dependent claim 11 for at least the reason that Maeda does not describe the apparatus further comprising a plurality of first conductors designated as data signal lines and second conductors as supply and return lines, in accordance with Applicants' dependent claim 11. In particular, Maeda requires that either electrically conductive terminals 5 or coaxial cables 29 be used, but not both. (See Maeda column 6 lines 19-23).

Thus, the Patent Office has not identified and Applicants are unable to find any description in Maeda of first conductors designated as data signal lines and second conductors designated as supply and return lines, as required by Applicants' dependent claim 11. Hence, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office withdraw the rejection of dependent claim 11 as being anticipated by Maeda for this additional reason.

Applicants submit that in addition to being allowable as dependent upon allowable base claim 1, dependent claims 12 and 13, as amended, are dependent upon allowable base claim 11, are patentable over the cited references for at least the added reasons explained above for claim 11. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office withdraw the rejection of dependent claims 12 and 13 as being unpatentable over the cited references for this additional reason.

II. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants note with appreciation that the Patent Office has indicated that claims 14-16 are objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending (1) are in proper form, (2) are neither obvious nor anticipated by the relied upon art of record, and (3) are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Patent Office believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Patent Office is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Dated: January 30, 2004


William Thomas Babbitt
William Thomas Babbitt, Reg. No. 39,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025
(310) 207-3800

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendments, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on January 30, 2004.


Jean Svoboda